

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-3 and 5-18 under 35 USC 102(e); and rejected claims 4 and 19-21 under 35 USC 103(a). These rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 6, 7-9, 11, 13, 16, 19 and 20 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Entry of these amendments would neither create substantial new issues nor require additional searching. New claims 22 and 23 have been added to the application. Claims 1-3, 5-20, 22 and 23 are pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER 35 USC 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The use of the phrase "governmental entity" in the claims is appropriate. Although the original disclosure did not contain the identical phrase, the original disclosure supports the use of the phrase in the claims. For example, those skilled in the art know that "the Copyright Office" and "the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office" are indeed "governmental entities." Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has removed the "governmental entity" phrase from the claims. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

### PATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-21

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-3 and 5-18 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Freivald et al., U.S. Patent 5,898,836, and rejected claims 4 and 19-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Freivald et al. in combination with Glogau. These rejections are fully traversed below.

Further to the remarks from the Amendment filed August 7, 2003, which are hereby incorporated herein by reference, the following additional remarks are provided.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits: "Freivald et al. does not disclose the prior registration as being a copyright registration with the U.S. Copyright Office." While Glogau does disclose a copyright registration system for a web site, there is nothing in Freivald et al. or Glogau that would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Glogau with Freivald et al. Glogau describes a web site copyright registration system and method, and Freivald et al. describes a change-detection tool that detects changes in web page documents. Nothing, however, teaches, suggests or motivates the combination of these references. The combination of these references must then be the result of improper hindsight because the only suggestion or motivation to make this combination is from Applicant's own application. Even if these reference were to be combined, neither reference is concerned with updating prior registrations (copyright registrations).

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 USC §§ 102(e), 103(a).

### **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that claims 1-3, 5-20, 22 and 23 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

Telephone: (650) 961-8300